

This Note Not Good After Oct. 10, 1898.

## No Line of Pianos

have ever attracted more attention than that found at Perry Brothers' Music Store.

## THE KNABE

Can show more artistic worth than any piano made today, while the Vose, Briggs and Ludwig are gaining as substantial reputation here as any piano made. We are loyal to these excellent instruments, and have handled them from 10 to 14 years.

## PERRY BROS

205 Wyoming Ave.

THE  
**CARBON**  
The finest and most permanent  
Photograph known. See them at  
the  
**GRIFFIN ART STUDIO**  
No Stairs.

## DR. A. A. LINDABURY.

Specialties—Surgery, Diseases of Women  
Office Hours—9 to 10 a. m.  
11 to 3 p. m.  
At Residence—7 to 8 p. m.  
Office—Williams Building, Opp. Postoffice.  
Residence—210 South Main Avenue.

## COLUMBIAN DETECTIVE AGENCY

LIME BARK BUILDING, SCRANTON, PA.

Matters Solicited Where Others Failed.  
Moderate Charges.

## CHAS. McMULLEN &amp; CO.

Have opened a General Insurance Office in

The Traders' National Bank Bldg.

Best Stock Companies represented. Large  
Share especially solicited. Telephone 1345.

## Cut Rate Camera and Supply House

Write or Call for Price List.  
KEMP, 103 Wyoming Avenue.

## PRICES

not the lowest, yet low  
costs during the CHAR-  
ACTER of our work. We furnish the  
BEST REGULARLY. A TRIAL will  
convince the most skeptical.

## LACKAWANNA LAUNDRY.

308 PENN AVE. A. B. WARMAN.

## The Wilkes-Barre Record can be had

at Scranton at the news stands of Reiss-  
man Bros., 401 Spruce and 401 Linden  
streets; Mac, Lackawanna avenue.

## PERSONAL.

Alderman Kouson was in Montrose yester-  
day.

Dr. R. H. Gibbons was in Honesdale yester-  
day.

L. M. Meyer, of Jonas Long's Sons' store, has returned from New York after a ten-day business visit.

Frank De Long, of the street commission-  
er's office, was at his desk yesterday  
after a visit to the metropolis.

Philip J. Vetter, Jr., of Penn avenue, has  
returned to Bellevue hospital Medical  
college to resume his studies.

Mr. and Mrs. A. D. Spencer and A. J. Casey, of this city, were in the Mis-  
souri, in Philadelphia, Tuesday.

Judge and Mrs. H. M. Edwards have  
arrived at Salt Lake City, where Judge  
Edwards will act as conductor at the big  
eleventh day held there.

Sergeant Robert Deller, of the central  
police station has entered upon his an-  
nual vacation of ten days, and his place  
is being filled by Patrolman John Jolner.

Mrs. Metzger, of Glenburn, Mrs. Reed  
and Miss Reed, of Avoca, and the Misses  
Clara and Florence Arryansen, of Wad-  
rick, N. J., spent Tuesday with Mrs. W.  
C. Smithing, of North Main avenue.

A. T. Raynolds, of The Tribune's city  
staff, has been granted a month's leave  
of absence, which he will spend in Sus-  
quehanna county for the purpose of re-  
cuperating his health. His place is being  
filled by John T. Brown.

James Gaynor leaves today for St.  
Louis, Mo., to attend the Supreme coun-  
cil of the Young Men's institute, which  
will convene in that city next Monday.

Mr. Gaynor is a member of the board of  
grand directors of the Supreme councils  
which meets Saturday. City Solicitor M.  
A. Moloney is one of the delegates from  
the Pennsylvania jurisdiction to the meet-  
ing of the Supreme council. He will leave  
for St. Louis tomorrow.

## COMPANY STOPPED PAYMENTS.

Suit Growing Out of "Pop" Laine's  
Unsuccessful Ventures.

Suit was instituted yesterday against  
the Scranton Traction company by  
John Benore, Thomas F. Mullen and  
A. J. Atkinson, trustees of certain  
creditors of J. H. Laine and Laurel Hill  
park to recover \$1,007, which it is claim-  
ed is owing on a contract agreement.

When Laine's troubles as manager of  
the park were being adjusted an agree-  
ment was reached whereby the three  
trustees above mentioned were to take

charge of the park and run it until  
such time as the proceeds paid off the  
indebtedness, the Traction company,  
agreeing to chip in \$2,000 a year to help  
the thing along, the company being  
in danger of being held for all of  
Laine's debts as he alleged he was acting  
as its agent.

## BACK FROM CAMP MEADE.

D. B. Atherton Will Make His Re-  
port This Afternoon.

D. B. Atherton, secretary of the Sol-  
diers' Relief association, returned yester-  
day afternoon from his visit to  
Camp Meade, where he went in refer-  
ence to securing the discharge of mem-  
bers of the Thirtieth regiment who  
are the heads of families. The result  
of his labors will be given in a report  
to the Relief association this after-  
noon.

Mr. Atherton has up to date received  
about fifty applications for discharge  
from the regiment. He said the Thir-  
teenth has a nice camp site and with  
the exception of those who are ur-  
gently needed to provide for their fam-  
ilies at home, the men seem to be  
reasonably contented with their lot  
and are looking forward with much  
expectation to their trip to Cuba.

## VAN WORMER APPOINTED.

Duties of Referee Appointed Tuesday  
by Judge Buffington in Accord-  
ance with the Provisions  
of Bankruptcy Act.

As briefly announced in yesterday's  
Tribune, Attorney C. A. Van Wormer,  
formerly of this city, now of Montrose,  
has been appointed by Judge Buffington,  
of the United States district court,  
as referee for this district under the  
new bankruptcy bill. The limits of the  
district have not as yet been announ-  
ced, but it is understood that Lacka-  
wanna, Wyoming, Bradford, Susque-  
hanna, Wayne, Pike and Monroe coun-  
ties will comprise it.

The duties of the referee are sub-  
stantially the same as those of the  
register under the old bankruptcy law,  
but the office is far from being as re-  
munerative as it formerly was. Under  
the old law the referee received a \$50  
fee for each case filed, in addition to  
a fat commission. Under the new law  
the referee receives only \$10 as a fee  
and that solely in cases of involuntary  
bankruptcy. In cases of voluntary  
bankruptcy he must be satisfied with  
the commission—one-half of one per  
cent on such moneys as are to be paid  
to creditors.

The appointment is for the term of  
two years and the incumbent is pro-  
scribed from holding any other office  
of profit or emolument under the United  
States government.

The duties of the referee are to con-  
sider all petitions referred to him by  
the clerk of the United States court,  
with whom, of course, all petitions  
must be filed, and then after due con-  
sideration adjudicate or dismiss them.  
He has all the powers in the premises  
that a judge would have, excepting that  
of commitment.

He is to declare dividends and pay  
them to the trustees; examine the es-  
tate of the alleged bankrupt and make  
a list of the creditors; furnish a state-  
ment of the condition of estates in  
process of administration before him,  
as may be requested by the parties in  
interest, and safely keep and transmit  
to the clerk all records of the case  
when it is concluded.

It is likely that Mr. Van Wormer  
will establish an office in the Federal  
building in this city, but this is not  
certain as he is not required to do so  
and as the whole practice of the law is  
still in its earliest experimental state.

## THE ARRIVAL AT LEBANON.

Described by the Evening News of  
That City.

The Lebanon News of Tuesday after-  
noon, with reference to the arrival  
of the Scranton delegation of firemen:  
The delegation from Scranton, num-  
bering several hundred, arrived here on a  
special train over the Philadelphia and  
Reading road this afternoon. The party  
is composed of Mayor James G. Bailey,  
the joint councilman committee, con-  
sisting of Wade M. Finn, chairman; John  
E. Roche, treasurer; E. F. Wentzel, sec-  
retary; Charles F. Wentzel, Fred Zeiman,  
M. F. Gilroy, Simon Thomas, T. C. Mel-  
vine, C. F. Wagner and Adam Schroeffer.  
In the party is the celebrated Century  
Hose company, No. 19, of forty men,  
finely uniformed in fatigue and dress  
suits, with President Emil Bonn and Cap-  
tain J. A. O'Hara in charge.

The splendid band of thirty-five  
pieces, a large representation from the  
Scranton business men's club and Chief  
P. J. Hughes, who also is the party.  
They are leaving Scranton for the convention  
in 1899 and have brought with them 1,000  
beautiful medallions and a large amount  
of advertising matter. During their stay  
here the company are the guests of the  
Perse boys and will have their headquar-  
ters at the Central hotel.

Among others in the party are Council-  
men Philip Wirth and Ed Fabell, School  
Controller Louis Schwass, Emil Bonn,  
assistant clerk of the courts; Senator J.  
C. Vaughan and others. The city of  
Scranton spends \$20,000 a year for its fire  
department.

## WANTS PROPERTY DIVIDED.

Joint Owners Disagree on Division of  
Profits.

Equity proceedings to secure a par-  
tition of a Providence property were  
instituted yesterday by Jane Reap.

In the fall of 1896 by ejectment pro-  
ceedings she established her right to a  
one-eighth interest in the Gabagan  
property on West Market street, where  
John Gabagan, one of the heirs, occu-  
pies and controls, he having bought  
up all but the one-eighth interest which  
Mrs. Reap holds.

He refused to give her what she con-  
sidered was her fair share of the rents  
and hence the suit. E. C. Newcomb  
and C. Conneys are her attorneys.

## ORGAN RECITAL.

Elm Park Church.

Prof. J. Alfred Pennington will give  
an organ recital in Elm Park church  
next Friday evening, when he will be  
assisted by Mrs. Joseph O'Brien, soprano,  
and Miss Caroline T. Conding, of the  
Conservatory of Music, education-  
ist. Admission, silver offering.

The Ladies' Aid society of the Elm  
Park church will serve their first sup-  
per of the season Thursday from 5 to  
7 p. m.

We have a few bicycles left. Cash  
talks. Come and see us. Jurish &  
Co., 423 Spruce street.

The finest peaches of the year, only  
50 and 75 per basket. 106 Penn avenue.

VERDICTS RENDERED  
IN COMMON PLEASTWO DEFENDANTS AND ONE  
PLAINTIFF ARE VICTORS.

In the Case of Williams Against  
Healey One Side Leaves It to the  
Jury to Infer That the Other Is  
Suing on a Forged Note and the  
Other Would Have It That the One  
Is Lying Like a Trooper or Else  
Has an Abnormally Defective  
Memory.

In common pleas court yesterday ver-  
dicts for the defendants were re-  
turned in the jointly tried cases of C. H.  
Gerowe against the C. M. Haspood  
Shoe company and William Needy.

The defendants seized upon and sold  
on execution a quantity of shoes at the  
property of F. L. Riefenberg, at Riefen-  
berg's shoe store in Carbondale,  
Gerowe, who is a business man in  
Oneonta, N. Y., came in with a claim  
for the goods, alleging that he owned  
the store and stocked it and that R.  
F. Riefenberg and not A. L. Riefenberg  
was in charge of it. The jury believed  
that the last named Riefenberg was  
in control of the stock and by their  
verdict said that the sale was regular.

In the case in which A. L. Rhodes  
was plaintiff and E. Vaughan the de-  
fendant, the jury returned a verdict in  
favor of the plaintiff for \$72. Rhodes  
sold a pair of oxen for \$100. When  
Vaughan received them he was not  
satisfied with their condition and not-  
ifying Rhodes that the cattle were not  
as represented refused payment and  
ordered them taken away. There was  
a conflict of testimony all through the  
case and particularly on the details  
of Vaughan's notification to Rhodes  
to take the oxen away.

In the case in which A. L. Rhodes  
was plaintiff and E. Vaughan the de-  
fendant, the jury returned a verdict in  
favor of the plaintiff for \$72. Rhodes  
sold a pair of oxen for \$100. When  
Vaughan received them he was not  
satisfied with their condition and not-  
ifying Rhodes that the cattle were not  
as represented refused payment and  
ordered them taken away. There was  
a conflict of testimony all through the  
case and particularly on the details  
of Vaughan's notification to Rhodes  
to take the oxen away.

In the case in which A. L. Rhodes  
was plaintiff and E. Vaughan the de-  
fendant, the jury returned a verdict in  
favor of the plaintiff for \$72. Rhodes  
sold a pair of oxen for \$100. When  
Vaughan received them he was not  
satisfied with their condition and not-  
ifying Rhodes that the cattle were not  
as represented refused payment and  
ordered them taken away. There was  
a conflict of testimony all through the  
case and particularly on the details  
of Vaughan's notification to Rhodes  
to take the oxen away.

In the case in which A. L. Rhodes  
was plaintiff and E. Vaughan the de-  
fendant, the jury returned a verdict in  
favor of the plaintiff for \$72. Rhodes  
sold a pair of oxen for \$100. When  
Vaughan received them he was not  
satisfied with their condition and not-  
ifying Rhodes that the cattle were not  
as represented refused payment and  
ordered them taken away. There was  
a conflict of testimony all through the  
case and particularly on the details  
of Vaughan's notification to Rhodes  
to take the oxen away.

In the case in which A. L. Rhodes  
was plaintiff and E. Vaughan the de-  
fendant, the jury returned a verdict in  
favor of the plaintiff for \$72. Rhodes  
sold a pair of oxen for \$100. When  
Vaughan received them he was not  
satisfied with their condition and not-  
ifying Rhodes that the cattle were not  
as represented refused payment and  
ordered them taken away. There was  
a conflict of testimony all through the  
case and particularly on the details  
of Vaughan's notification to Rhodes  
to take the oxen away.

In the case in which A. L. Rhodes  
was plaintiff and E. Vaughan the de-  
fendant, the jury returned a verdict in  
favor of the plaintiff for \$72. Rhodes  
sold a pair of oxen for \$100. When  
Vaughan received them he was not  
satisfied with their condition and not-  
ifying Rhodes that the cattle were not  
as represented refused payment and  
ordered them taken away. There was  
a conflict of testimony all through the  
case and particularly on the details  
of Vaughan's notification to Rhodes  
to take the oxen away.

In the case in which A. L. Rhodes  
was plaintiff and E. Vaughan the de-  
fendant, the jury returned a verdict in  
favor of the plaintiff for \$72. Rhodes  
sold a pair of oxen for \$100. When  
Vaughan received them he was not  
satisfied with their condition and not-  
ifying Rhodes that the cattle were not  
as represented refused payment and  
ordered them taken away. There was  
a conflict of testimony all through the  
case and particularly on the details  
of Vaughan's notification to Rhodes  
to take the oxen away.

In the case in which A. L. Rhodes  
was plaintiff and E. Vaughan the de-  
fendant, the jury returned a verdict in  
favor of the plaintiff for \$72. Rhodes  
sold a pair of oxen for \$100. When  
Vaughan received them he was not  
satisfied with their condition and not-  
ifying Rhodes that the cattle were not  
as represented refused payment and  
ordered them taken away. There was  
a conflict of testimony all through the  
case and particularly on the details  
of Vaughan's notification to Rhodes  
to take the oxen away.

In the case in which A. L. Rhodes  
was plaintiff and E. Vaughan the de-  
fendant, the jury returned a verdict in  
favor of the plaintiff for \$72. Rhodes  
sold a pair of oxen for \$100. When  
Vaughan received them he was not  
satisfied with their condition and not-  
ifying Rhodes that the cattle were not  
as represented refused payment and  
ordered them taken away. There was  
a conflict of testimony all through the  
case and particularly on the details  
of Vaughan's notification to Rhodes  
to take the oxen away.

In the case in which A. L. Rhodes  
was plaintiff and E. Vaughan the de-  
fendant, the jury returned a verdict in  
favor of the plaintiff for \$72. Rhodes  
sold a pair of oxen for \$100. When  
Vaughan received them he was not  
satisfied with their condition and not-  
ifying Rhodes that the cattle were not  
as represented refused payment and  
ordered them taken away. There was  
a conflict of testimony all through the  
case and particularly on the details  
of Vaughan's notification to Rhodes  
to take the oxen away.

In the case in which A. L. Rhodes  
was plaintiff and E. Vaughan the de-  
fendant, the jury returned a verdict in  
favor of the plaintiff for \$72. Rhodes  
sold a pair of oxen for \$100. When  
Vaughan received them he was not  
satisfied with their condition and not-  
ifying Rhodes that the cattle were not  
as represented refused payment and  
ordered them taken away. There was  
a conflict of testimony all through the  
case and particularly on the details  
of Vaughan's notification to Rhodes  
to take the oxen away.

In the case in which A. L. Rhodes  
was plaintiff and E. Vaughan the de-  
fendant, the jury returned a verdict in  
favor of the plaintiff for \$72. Rhodes  
sold a pair of oxen for \$100. When  
Vaughan received them he was not  
satisfied with their condition and not-  
ifying Rhodes that the cattle were not  
as represented refused payment and  
ordered them taken away. There was  
a conflict of testimony all through the  
case and particularly on the details  
of Vaughan's notification to Rhodes  
to take the oxen away.

In the case in which A. L. Rhodes  
was plaintiff and E. Vaughan the de-  
fendant, the jury returned a verdict in  
favor of the plaintiff for \$72. Rhodes  
sold a pair of oxen for \$100. When  
Vaughan received them he was not  
satisfied with their condition and not-  
ifying Rhodes that the cattle were not  
as represented refused payment and  
ordered them taken away. There was  
a conflict of testimony all through the  
case and particularly on the details  
of Vaughan's notification to Rhodes  
to take the oxen away.

In the case in which A. L. Rhodes  
was plaintiff and E. Vaughan the de-  
fendant, the jury returned a verdict in  
favor of the plaintiff for \$72. Rhodes  
sold a pair of oxen for \$100. When  
Vaughan received them he was not  
satisfied with their condition and not-  
ifying Rhodes that the cattle were not  
as represented refused payment and  
ordered them taken away. There was  
a conflict of testimony all through the  
case and particularly on the details  
of Vaughan's notification to Rhodes  
to take the oxen away.

In the case in which A. L. Rhodes  
was plaintiff and E. Vaughan the de-  
fendant, the jury returned a verdict in  
favor of the plaintiff for \$72. Rhodes  
sold a pair of oxen for \$100. When  
Vaughan received them he was not  
satisfied with their condition and not-  
ifying Rhodes that the cattle were not  
as represented refused payment and  
ordered them taken away. There was  
a conflict of testimony all through the  
case and particularly on the details  
of Vaughan's notification to Rhodes  
to take the oxen away.

In the case in which A. L. Rhodes  
was plaintiff and E. Vaughan the de-  
fendant, the jury returned a verdict in  
favor of the plaintiff for \$72. Rhodes  
sold a pair of oxen for \$100. When  
Vaughan received them he was not  
satisfied with their condition and not-  
ifying Rhodes that the cattle were not  
as represented refused payment and  
ordered them taken away. There was  
a conflict of testimony all through the  
case and particularly on the details  
of Vaughan's notification to Rhodes  
to take the oxen away.

In the case in which A. L. Rhodes  
was plaintiff and E. Vaughan the de-  
fendant, the jury returned a verdict in  
favor of the plaintiff for \$72. Rhodes  
sold a pair of oxen for \$100. When  
Vaughan received them he was not  
satisfied with their condition and not-  
ifying Rhodes that the cattle were not  
as represented refused payment and  
ordered them taken away. There was  
a conflict of testimony all through the  
case and particularly on the details  
of Vaughan's notification to Rhodes  
to take the oxen away.

In the case in which A. L. Rhodes  
was plaintiff and E. Vaughan the de-  
fendant, the jury returned a verdict in  
favor of the plaintiff for \$72. Rhodes  
sold a pair of oxen for \$100. When  
Vaughan received them he was not  
satisfied with their condition and not-  
ifying Rhodes that the cattle were not  
as represented refused payment and  
ordered them taken away. There was  
a conflict of testimony all through the  
case and particularly on the details  
of Vaughan's notification to Rhodes  
to take the oxen away.

In the case in which A. L. Rhodes  
was plaintiff and E. Vaughan the de-  
fendant, the jury returned a verdict in  
favor of the plaintiff for \$72. Rhodes  
sold a pair of oxen for \$100. When  
Vaughan received them he was not  
satisfied with their condition and not-  
ifying Rhodes that the cattle were not  
as represented refused payment and  
ordered them taken away. There was  
a conflict of testimony all through the  
case and particularly on the details  
of Vaughan's notification to Rhodes  
to take the oxen away.

In the case in which A. L. Rhodes  
was plaintiff and E. Vaughan the de-  
fendant, the jury returned a verdict in  
favor of the plaintiff for \$72. Rhodes  
sold a pair of oxen for \$100. When  
Vaughan received them he was not  
satisfied with their condition and not-  
ifying Rhodes that the cattle were not  
as represented refused payment and  
ordered them taken away. There was  
a conflict of testimony all through the  
case and particularly on the details  
of Vaughan's notification to Rhodes  
to take the oxen away.

In the case in which A. L. Rhodes  
was plaintiff and E. Vaughan the de-  
fendant, the jury returned a verdict in  
favor of the plaintiff for \$72. Rhodes  
sold a pair of oxen for \$100. When  
Vaughan received them he was not  
satisfied with their condition and not-  
ifying Rhodes that the cattle were not  
as represented refused payment and  
ordered them taken away. There was  
a conflict of testimony all through the  
case and particularly on the details  
of Vaughan's notification to Rhodes  
to take the oxen away.

In the case in which A. L. Rhodes  
was plaintiff and E. Vaughan the de-  
fendant, the jury returned a verdict in  
favor of the plaintiff for \$72. Rhodes  
sold a pair of oxen for \$100. When  
Vaughan received them he was not  
satisfied with their condition and not-  
ifying Rhodes that the cattle were not  
as represented refused payment and  
ordered them taken away. There was  
a conflict of testimony all through the  
case and particularly on the details  
of Vaughan's notification to Rhodes  
to take the oxen away.

In the case in which A. L. Rhodes  
was plaintiff and E. Vaughan the de-  
fendant, the jury returned a verdict in  
favor of the plaintiff for \$72. Rhodes  
sold a pair of oxen for \$100. When  
Vaughan received them he was not  
satisfied with their condition and not-  
ifying Rhodes that the cattle were not  
as represented refused payment and  
ordered them taken away. There was  
a conflict of testimony all through the  
case and particularly on the details  
of Vaughan's notification to Rhodes  
to take the oxen away.

In the case in which A. L. Rhodes  
was plaintiff and E. Vaughan the de-  
fendant, the jury returned a verdict in  
favor of the plaintiff for \$72. Rhodes  
sold a pair of oxen for \$100. When  
Vaughan received them he was not  
satisfied with their condition and not-  
ifying Rhodes that the cattle were not  
as represented refused payment and  
ordered them taken away. There was  
a conflict of testimony all through the  
case and particularly on the details  
of Vaughan's notification to Rhodes  
to take the oxen away.

In the case in which A. L. Rhodes  
was plaintiff and E. Vaughan the de-  
fendant, the jury returned a verdict in  
favor of the plaintiff for \$72. Rhodes  
sold a pair of oxen for \$100. When  
Vaughan received them he was not  
satisfied with their condition and not-  
ifying Rhodes that the cattle were not  
as represented refused payment and  
ordered them taken away. There was  
a conflict of testimony all through the  
case and particularly on the details  
of Vaughan's notification to Rhodes  
to take the oxen away.

In the case in which A. L. Rhodes  
was plaintiff and E. Vaughan the de-  
fendant, the jury returned a verdict in  
favor of the plaintiff for \$72. Rhodes  
sold a pair of oxen for \$100. When  
Vaughan received them he was not  
satisfied with their condition and not-  
ifying Rhodes that the cattle were not  
as represented refused payment and  
ordered them taken away. There was  
a conflict of testimony all through the  
case and particularly on the details  
of Vaughan's notification to Rhodes  
to take the oxen away.

In the case in which A. L. Rhodes  
was plaintiff and E. Vaughan the de-  
fendant, the jury returned a verdict in  
favor of the plaintiff for \$72. Rhodes  
sold a pair of oxen for \$100. When  
Vaughan received them he was not  
satisfied with their condition and not-  
ifying Rhodes that the cattle were not  
as represented refused payment and  
ordered them taken away. There was  
a conflict of testimony all through the  
case and particularly on the details  
of Vaughan's notification to Rhodes  
to take the oxen away.

In the case in which A. L. Rhodes  
was plaintiff and E. Vaughan the de-  
fendant, the jury returned a verdict in  
favor of the plaintiff for \$72. Rhodes  
sold a pair of oxen for \$100. When  
Vaughan received them he was not  
satisfied with their condition and not-  
ifying Rhodes that the cattle were not  
as represented refused payment and  
ordered them taken away. There was  
a conflict of testimony all through the  
case and particularly on the details  
of Vaughan's notification to Rhodes  
to take the oxen away.

In the case in which A. L. Rhodes  
was plaintiff and E. Vaughan the de-  
fendant, the jury returned a verdict in  
favor of the plaintiff for \$72. Rhodes  
sold a pair of oxen for \$100. When  
Vaughan received them he was not  
satisfied with their condition and not-  
ifying Rhodes that the cattle were not  
as represented refused payment and  
ordered them taken away. There was  
a conflict of testimony all through the  
case and particularly on the details  
of Vaughan's notification to Rhodes  
to take the oxen away.

In the case in which A. L. Rhodes  
was plaintiff and E. Vaughan the de-  
fendant, the jury returned a verdict in  
favor of the plaintiff for \$72. Rhodes  
sold a pair of oxen for \$100. When  
Vaughan received them he was not  
satisfied with their condition and not-  
ifying Rhodes that the cattle were not  
as represented refused payment and  
ordered them taken away. There was  
a conflict of testimony all through the  
case and particularly on the details  
of Vaughan's notification to Rhodes  
to take the oxen away.

In the case in which A. L. Rhodes  
was plaintiff and E. Vaughan the de-  
fendant, the jury returned a verdict in  
favor of the plaintiff for \$72. Rhodes  
sold a pair of oxen for \$100. When  
Vaughan received them he was not  
satisfied with their condition and not-  
ifying Rhodes that the cattle were not  
as represented refused payment and  
ordered them taken away. There was  
a conflict of testimony all through the  
case and particularly on the details  
of Vaughan's notification to Rhodes  
to take the oxen away.

In the case in which A. L. Rhodes  
was plaintiff and E. Vaughan the de-  
fendant, the jury returned a verdict in  
favor of the plaintiff for \$72. Rhodes  
sold a pair of oxen for \$100. When  
Vaughan received them he was not  
satisfied with their condition and not-  
ifying Rhodes that the cattle were not  
as represented refused payment and  
ordered them taken away. There was  
a conflict of testimony all through the  
case and particularly on the details  
of Vaughan's notification to Rhodes  
to take the oxen away.

In the case in which A. L. Rhodes  
was plaintiff and E. Vaughan the de-  
fendant, the jury returned a verdict in  
favor of the plaintiff for \$72. Rhodes  
sold a pair of oxen for \$100. When  
Vaughan received them he was not  
satisfied with their condition and not-  
ifying Rhodes that the cattle were not  
as represented refused payment and  
ordered them taken away. There was  
a conflict of testimony all through the  
case and particularly on the details  
of Vaughan's notification to Rhodes  
to take the oxen away.

In the case in which A. L. Rhodes  
was plaintiff and E. Vaughan the de-  
fendant, the jury returned a verdict in  
favor of the plaintiff for \$72. Rhodes  
sold a pair of oxen for \$100. When  
Vaughan received them he was not  
satisfied with their condition and not-  
ifying Rhodes that the cattle were not  
as represented refused payment and  
ordered them taken away. There was  
a conflict of testimony all through the  
case and particularly on the details  
of Vaughan's notification to Rhodes  
to take the oxen away.

In the case in which A. L. Rhodes  
was plaintiff and E. Vaughan the de-  
fendant, the jury returned a verdict in  
favor of the plaintiff for \$72. Rhodes  
sold a pair of oxen for \$100. When  
Vaughan received them he was not  
satisfied with their condition and not-  
ifying Rhodes that the cattle were not  
as represented refused payment and  
ordered them taken away. There was  
a conflict of testimony all through the  
case and particularly on the details  
of Vaughan's notification to Rhodes  
to take the oxen away.

In the case in which A. L. Rhodes  
was plaintiff and E. Vaughan the de-  
fendant, the jury returned a verdict in  
favor of the plaintiff for \$72. Rhodes  
sold a pair of oxen for \$100. When  
Vaughan received them he was not  
satisfied with their condition and not-  
ifying Rhodes that the cattle were not  
as represented refused payment and  
ordered them taken away. There was  
a conflict of testimony all through the  
case and particularly on the details  
of Vaughan's notification to Rhodes  
to take the oxen away.

In the case in which A. L. Rhodes  
was plaintiff and E. Vaughan the de-  
fendant, the jury returned a verdict in  
favor of the plaintiff for \$72. Rhodes  
sold a pair of oxen for \$100. When  
Vaughan received them he was not  
satisfied with their condition and not-  
ifying Rhodes that the cattle were not  
as represented refused payment and  
ordered them taken away. There was  
a conflict of testimony all through the  
case and particularly on the details  
of Vaughan's notification to Rhodes  
to take the oxen away.

In the case in which A. L. Rhodes  
was plaintiff and E. Vaughan the de-  
fendant, the jury returned a verdict in  
favor of the plaintiff for \$72. Rhodes  
sold a pair of oxen for \$100. When  
Vaughan received them he was not  
satisfied with their condition and not-  
ifying Rhodes that the cattle were not  
as represented refused payment and  
ordered them taken away. There was  
a conflict of testimony all through the  
case and particularly on the details  
of Vaughan's notification to Rhodes  
to take the oxen away.